

the landless and reasonable reimbursement for those whose land was seized.

Today both promises have long since been forgotten.

Except for a few thousand showcase examples in which peasants were given plots of land as their own, Cuba's great agricultural holdings have passed into the hands of the state, controlled and operated by Castro's powerful Institute of Agrarian reform.

Most of the land has been lumped into a variety of cooperatives or collective farms. As in Russia, the former peasants now work for the state instead of landlords, and frequently for far less income.

For a few months after the Institute of Agrarian Reform started, Castro and his lieutenants spoke loudly of government bonds to be issued as a reimbursement for seized property.

Then all mention of reimbursement—and bonds—was dropped. Even the pretense of repayment disappeared when President Eisenhower cut off Cuban sugar sales to the United States. Castro announced coldly that American holdings in Cuba had been confiscated.

PROMISES FORGOTTEN

Castro's promises of personal liberty, of freedom from army and police excesses he had condemned during the Batista regime, were forgotten as quickly as his pledges to pay for land.

For many months all Cubans—and some foreigners—not actively identified with his revolutionary program faced danger of arrest, a quick military trial, and imprisonment or execution against a brick wall.

Lawyers who defended victims of arrest and military trial said the hearings were farces, that frequently verdicts, even death penalties, were decided before the hearings began.

MILITARY POWER GROWING

Castro's growing military power in Cuba has kept almost exact pace with the emergence of communism as the dominant factor there. When his Communist trained militia-men beat back the invasion in April they did it largely with Communist weapons, and observers reported Russian, Chinese, and Czech military instructors played a big part in the fighting.

Russian, Czech, and Chinese advisers were not only on the Cuban battlefield but are in every activity of the Castro regime.

Thrice-weekly KLM planes bring them by the dozens from Europe by way of Curacao to avoid the United States. Every incoming cargo, oil, and sugar boat from the Iron Curtain has its quota of unannounced passengers.

As the last American correspondents left Cuba, diplomats were talking of the expected arrival of four Russian destroyers, gifts to the Castro regime. These sources claimed at least two were already on the way, flying Cuban flags but manned by Russian sailors in the absence of qualified and trained Cuban officers and men.

Today Castro has the strongest fighting force in Cuban history, if not in all Latin America, aside from a weak air force and a small navy. He has placed more than 400,000 men and women under arms.

IS THERE A SOLUTION?

Is there a possible solution to the Cuban "problem"?

Foreign diplomats and other observers with whom I talked before leaving Havana recommended various measures ranging from outright and immediate military intervention by the United States to a firm and complete embargo on all trade with Cuba.

Cubans were sharply and at times hysterically critical of the U.S. Government for announcing an embargo, then continuing to sell foodstuffs and medicines to Cuba and buying tobacco and fruits from the Communist government.

Less vitriolic but no less intense was a Cuban businessman who reminded me of Castro's steady military buildup.

"Castro had no MIG fighters during the April invasion," the businessman said. "But don't forget the next time he may have."

"Every day he remains in power makes it that much harder to dig him out."

PROPOSAL TO LIMIT EXPENSE ACCOUNTS TO \$30 A DAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an interesting article entitled "If Adlai Had Only \$30 a Day, He'd Flop Big," written by George Sokolsky and published in the Miami Herald of July 5, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF ADLAI HAD ONLY \$30 A DAY, HE'D FLOP BIG
(By George E. Sokolsky)

It would not be absurd for one who was accustomed to live in a log cabin to find a \$30 a day expense account not only sufficient but with ample to spare. He might live on hamburgers and hot dogs, sleep wherever he could, sponge on his acquaintances, use kerosene instead of gasoline for his car, wear a beatnik costume and shave on Christmas and Easter only.

For the businessman, particularly salesmen, \$30 a day is almost too little to bother about, particularly if it is necessary to keep books too. And that is the worst thing about all these tax matters—the keeping of books. Let the boss get indigestion. Let the Japanese or West Germans sell the goods.

United States pays \$30,000 a year for Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's apartment at the Waldorf-Astoria. It is not too much. Such an Ambassador has to entertain constantly and he must have a suitable place for that purpose. We want votes in the United Nations and we need to do what is necessary and usual to get them.

What would happen to Adlai Stevenson's representation at the United Nations if he were permitted to spend only \$30 a day? Offhand I would say that he would meet with complete failure. Many of the delegates would be insulted because they were not invited to dinner according to protocol. This is the way of the world. For \$30 a day Stevenson could not do much entertaining at the Waldorf or any other hotel or restaurant in New York.

Of course, some businessmen have abused the expense accounts, for which there can be no justification. They charge everything that other men normally pay for themselves out of earnings to their business expense account. But the fact that some men are dishonest does not justify hogtying American business so that it cannot do its work adequately. That is the fallacy of generalizing from the particular.

One of the most important phases of American business activity is the convention. There men meet those who are in the same line or who have similar or associated interests. There they listen to speeches on important subjects, often by representatives of Government. There new ideas are widely circulated and new products are exhibited. The convention is essential to the conduct of modern business because men live so far apart.

Such conventions are usually held in large cities where there are suitable convention halls or in such special places as Hot Springs where the hotels are adjusted for the purposes. New York City has recently built the Coliseum for convention purposes at great expense. Many large cities maintain convention bureaus to get the conventions to come to their cities. As regards political

conventions cities are known to make a heavy contribution to the convention fund. The idea is that the shops, theaters, restaurants, hotels, benefit from conventions which bring considerable money into the town and they are worthwhile.

No one could attend a convention today on a top limit of \$30 a day. It would hardly pay for food, drinks, and cigars. If it were one of those affairs to which the wife was brought to prove that the male animal really was a very busy man, doing honest and useful work, \$30 a day would barely pay for the extra clothes mamma had to buy so that she might look as presentable as the rest of the folks. No man wants to hear:

"Business must be bad for Jack. Look at his wife. She wears clothes that a stenographer would not be seen in."

That can start sensitive business rumors that could do considerable damage. Business has many facets, not the least of which is establishing sound credit not only in the sense of current balance but confidence in the future. In this respect an expense account becomes as important as advertising or public relations.

When an expense account is used as untaxed salary, the twister should be punished for fraud. But when the expense account is used to stimulate business, to improve a product, to exchange ideas, to bring in customers, to be productive in the national welfare, then it is more than justified by the results it attains.

Certainly \$30 a day, at present prices, is not enough for anything.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE PAUL C. CUNNINGHAM, OF IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is with much personal sadness that I announce the death yesterday of former Representative Paul C. Cunningham, of Iowa. He died at his summer home near Nisswa, Minn.

Paul Cunningham was a longtime close personal friend of mine. We began our first public service together in the Iowa Legislature many years ago. Our friendship and association continued during that period of time.

I shall have more to say about former Representative Cunningham at some time in the near future. Meanwhile, I express my sincere sympathy to his wife, Gail, and to his children, who survive him.

I feel a deep sense of personal loss in the passing of a longtime, valued friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article relating to the death of former Representative Cunningham, which was published in the Washington Post of today, July 17, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM, IOWA, SERVED FROM 1940 TO 1958

Former Representative Paul C. Cunningham, Republican of Iowa, died yesterday at his summer home near Nisswa, Minn., after suffering an apparent heart attack. He was 71.

According to his wife, Mr. Cunningham was stricken in the morning while they were preparing to go to church.

He served in Congress 18 years from Iowa's Fifth District, the area in and around Des Moines, from his first election in 1940 until his defeat by the present incumbent, Democrat Neal Smith, in 1958.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11745

the decision and its results should have the power to judge major intelligence matters. By the same token such judgment must not be undermined by a subordinate having the authority to shape through administrative control the nature of intelligence that reaches his superiors.

The proper place for such clash of opinion to occur and for the judgments to be made is in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and the White House.

As a postscript, it seems appropriate to observe that we are indeed, through increasing reliance on electronic computers in attempting to predict the course of warfare, approaching a questionable situation. It has long been axiomatic in the field of military history that one of the most difficult tasks is trying to ascertain for sure what actually happened in war. Are we, in fact, unwittingly seeking escape from crucial decisions by delegating that responsibility to electronic computers; and are we thus trying to write history in advance? Are we succumbing to the same frailties as those ancients who before the battle consulted the oracles who were the then acknowledged experts in reading the future in tea leaves? If so, we have permitted electronics to bypass intellect and carry us full cycle into man's past, and man's mistakes.

Cuba **DANGER OF TRAGIC CUBAN SITUATION BECOMING PERMANENT**

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a new danger faces America today—as if we did not have enough already.

The tragic Cuban situation is in danger of becoming permanent if Fidel Castro is permitted to carry out his new troika formula. Castro hopes to solidify his Red dictatorship through a three-step program.

First, he seeks postponement of any hemispheric action against his regime at this time, to be followed by, second, toleration of his Communist rule, both by the nations of the Western Hemisphere and the whole world. Third, finally, he hopes to gain acceptance of his dictatorship in fact, if not in law.

The grave danger to this hemisphere if Castro continues in power has been pointed out in an important article written by Harold Mills, the Associated Press correspondent in Havana for the past 2 years, until he was forced to flee Cuba. Mills, who has been covering Communist trouble spots in the world for 15 years, said in this article:

Based on a knowledge of communism and its tactics learned firsthand in China, in the Soviet Union, and in Cuba, and in conversations with diplomats and competent observers in all these areas, I predict that communism will have a hold on much, if not all, Latin America in 3 years if the Castro regime remains in power in Cuba.

This is a sobering conclusion, but one which I believe is shockingly close to the truth.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mills' article, as published in the Miami Herald of June 18, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW RUSSIA, CHINA ARE USING CUBA TO SUBVERT LATIN AMERICA

(By Harold K. Mills)

Communist China and the Red regime of Fidel Castro stemmed from a common

front—agrarian reform—but the guiding hand behind both was that of the Kremlin.

Today Nikita Khrushchev and the Peiping Chinese are racing to see which can exploit Cuba fastest as a means of penetration to the rest of Latin America.

During the past 15 years of reporting news events abroad I have watched communism spread over once-free China, studied its rapid development in the Soviet Union, and witnessed its relentless envelopment of tiny Cuba.

The reaction to these developments and to their apparently placid acceptance by some Western peoples and governments, at times including our own, has been terrifying to one who knows what communism is.

There are profound similarities in the Chinese Communist revolution mounted from the cave-studded hills of remote Yenan after World War II and in the bearded Castro's adroit twist of a once popular democratic revolt against Cuban ex-Dictator Fulgencio Batista into a Russian and Red Chinese-guided regime.

These similarities represent to me further proof that both were shaped by the Kremlin in line with boasts I have heard Nikita Khrushchev make that the Soviet Union will some day bury the West.

When I first reached China in 1946 to report Gen. George Marshall's ill-fated peace mission, Communist leaders there had dropped their guise of agrarian reformers. They had emerged as full fledged, Moscow-directed and trained Communists as devoted to making their vast country Red as Khrushchev is to making ours a completely Communist world.

When I left Havana last month after 2 years of watching the Castro revolution swing steadily into the Communist camp, leaving many of his own lieutenants dead, in prison, or in exile, 6 million Cubans were trapped in a Communist military dictatorship as vicious and as cruel as any in the postwar years of Eastern Europe.

So, in the brief span of 15 years, world communism had routed the United States and its interests from a great area of the Pacific on the one hand and on the other given the Kremlin and its associates their own strategically placed "offshore" island only 90 miles from the American frontier.

LATINS TO FALL IN 3 YEARS

Based on a knowledge of communism and its tactics learned firsthand in China, in the Soviet Union, and in Cuba, and in conversations with diplomats and competent observers in all these areas, I predict that communism will have a hold on much of it, if not all Latin America in 3 years, if the Castro regime remains in power in Cuba.

The Castro philosophy and the Communist philosophy alike demand expansion. It is no secret today that Cuba and its 2-year-old revolutionary regime has been picked as the spearhead of Red penetration into other Latin American areas.

Castro himself announced publicly that he expected to see the Andes Mountains become the "Sierra Maestra," or birthplace, of new Castro-type revolutions in South America.

The big support Russia and Red China are giving Castro today, especially in armaments, are far greater than he requires in Cuba alone. The natural inference is that Cuba is simply a staging area for an advance into Latin America.

BEGAN IN SAME MANNER

A study of revolutionary movements at first hand in remote China and in neighboring Cuba produces some startling similarities.

Communist leaders in both nations—and Fidel Castro must now be included among them—began their campaigns with the promise of sweeping agrarian reforms aimed at helping the landless and the little people of the two nations.

Both battled admittedly corrupt regimes to achieve national power. In China the rule of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and in Cuba that of Batista degenerated into a succession of terroristic activities—now replaced by new tyrannies. In both nations the United States became the favorite whipping boy, and "Hate America" became the theme song of Communists and their associates.

Perhaps as a natural result of these similarities in origin, Red China is competing with the Kremlin today for the right to guide Cuban policies and the overall program of Communist penetration into the rest of Latin America.

Cuban Communist leaders, who boasted in the past that they control Fidel Castro's mind, and so can afford to permit him to continue as head of the revolutionary government, give strong lip service to both the Moscow and the Peiping regimes.

LATIN AMERICA FERTILE

During 3 years in China I talked with Mao Tze-tung and more frequently with Premier Chou En-lai and his top lieutenant, Wang Ping-nan, now Peiping's Ambassador in Poland.

All three spoke with interest about Latin America and all three even at that time regarded it as a fertile ground for Communist expansion once their war with stubborn, faltering Chiang Kai-shek was won. It took more than a dozen years and Castro's victory over Batista to open the way into Latin America for them.

There was no less interest about Latin America evidenced in Moscow where from 1956 through 1959 I watched Premier Khrushchev whip his followers into a race to out-produce and outperform the United States in every part of the world.

There I watched in 1959 as Cuban Communists fresh from the Castro victory described to an international meeting the prominent place Communists played in Castro's successful revolution.

Later in Havana these same leaders denied their own statements, claiming they were misquoted in Moscow. At that time Cuban communism was not yet ready to emerge as the real power behind bearded Fidel and his "humanist" revolution.

PROGRESS TO TERROR

Similarities of origin and hate of the United States were not the only parallels I found in the Chinese and Cuban revolutions. The pattern of development from a relatively democratic rule into a regime of armed terror was the same in each country.

Round-faced Mao used to tell visitors to his old Communist capital of Yenan how the overthrow of Chiang Kai-shek would liberate all Chinese from political and economic slavery.

"Each man will be his own master," he promised. "And every man who wants it, will own his own land."

His promised liberty for the Chinese millions was brief. Almost before they knew what was happening, the Chinese people were herded into communes and their land expropriated for collective or State-operated farms.

Personal liberty became as remote under communism in China as economic freedom. My own Chinese assistant was tried by a people's court in Nanking and executed by a pistol shot in the head, presumably because he had been a long associate and good friend of Americans. Thousands more suffered a like fate.

SAME PATTERN IN CUBA

Exactly the same pattern prevailed a decade later in Castro's Cuba.

Two years ago last May, Fidel Castro led his entire cabinet—including a minister of agriculture he executed recently for counterrevolutionary activities—into the Sierra Maestra mountains to enact a stringent agrarian reform law. It promised land for

ment and described them as the only ones suitable for Latin America and called for Communist aid for British Guiana. In 1960, Mr. Brindley Benn, chairman of the PPP and Minister of Natural Resources in the government declared: "It is easier to stop tomorrow than to stop communism." Last Monday, July 3, he repeated this statement and said that he had meant every word of it. Quantities of rice are shipped from British Guiana to Cuba and on Jagan's recent trip to the United States he was given a \$2-million loan from the World Bank which further bolstered his political position.

I met all sections of the population and all three political leaders. I had lengthy conversations with men who had been trained under the auspices of the PPP and the Young Communist League as saboteurs. They reported to me that the jobs which they were required to perform such as dynamiting, were always personally ordered by Mrs. Janet Jagan, Chicago-born wife of Dr. Jagan. These men told me that the dynamite used was stolen from big industrial companies and there is still a considerable cache in the possession of the PPP.

One hopeful aspect of the situation is the strong and united anti-communist position taken by both the Roman Catholic Bishop Guilly and Archbishop Knight, Anglican archbishop of the West Indies against the recent Government takeover of the 51 denominational schools and their antireligious attitude. American Christian interest has been demonstrated by the assistance given in the fight against communism by World Harvest Evangelists, an American religious group.

Both British and American public opinion must understand the gravity of the situation in British Guiana, which, because of its geographical location cannot fail to be as much an American concern as it is British. During my stay in British Guiana, I was repeatedly told by members of the European population, "We fear the British Government will let us down as they have the people in Kenya," although I found that large numbers of Negroes and Indians retain deep faith that the British Government will eventually intervene and save them from Communist domination.

I have two proposals to suggest. First, that private sources in the United States, in Britain or indeed in any other country concerned with human and world freedom, should support with immediate financial aid the growth and maintenance of the anti-Jagan pro-freedom political forces in British Guiana who are prepared to stand for democracy and the free way of life and who still have a fighting chance to win the election. The second is a recommendation for governmental action. If, under false pretenses, and thanks to the understandable political ignorance and inexperience of the population, the well-oiled political machine firmly established by Dr. Jagan and his wife, the PPP is elected to power, I believe that the British and American Governments should hold consultations at the highest levels, to determine what action can be taken to safeguard the rights and political and economic freedom of the people of Guiana who would otherwise then be powerless to defend themselves. I can only add that since elections take place next month, there is no time to be lost.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOVIET AIRPOWER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] may be allowed to proceed at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, once again the people of the United States find out about Soviet arms development as the result of their flying airplanes over Moscow for all to see.

This time they took up all cameras in the crowd, including and specifically cameras of members of the various delegations.

But because again of the enterprise of one of the authorities in this field, Robert Hotz of Aviation Week, we now have more information than the Soviets were willing to give out, in some cases more than various agencies, including the Central Intelligence Agency, knew about.

The cameras of Mr. Hotz and his associates were not taken up—and I have these additional pictures with me on the floor today if any Member of the Senate would be interested.

Before going into any detail, and especially because of the growing controversy over nuclear test resumption, I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be inserted in the RECORD a statement by the Honorable John McCone, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. This statement bears on both the question of nuclear testing and these new Russian airplanes—and if anyone disagrees with it I would ask that he say so now.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN A. MCCONE, FORMER CHAIRMAN, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Nuclear weapon development by underground and outer-space testing will give to either the United States or the Soviets an arsenal of weapons, both large and small, more powerful, more versatile and more useful in modern warfare than those now existent. The Soviets can proceed with these developments behind their walls of secrecy without detection as no present scientific means of discovering their actions exist or can be created without inspection posts within their country and the right for on-site inspection.

The Soviet's adamant refusal to accept a reasonable plan for policing a test ban agreement by refusing appropriate means for inspection is reason to believe they are developing new and improved weapons by clandestine testing. Thus they can develop

a great military superiority and we, respecting a self-imposed moratorium, will take second place.

Efforts to reach agreement have now failed because of Soviet unreasonable positions. Our security is at stake. We must resume weapon testing as essential to the safety of our country and the free world. Soviet protestations that they are not interested in testing appear undependable as similar statements were made frequently regarding manned aircraft but now they display several new military planes secretly developed. Will they soon display new advanced nuclear weapons?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would hope that we not be outmaneuvered to the point of disaster in the nuclear field, as we apparently, by listening to Mr. Khrushchev, have now been outraded seriously in the manned aircraft field.

Nothing could be more important than sound decision in these two fields, because they may well embrace the core of the future security of the United States.

Note that this 1961 show is the first Soviet military airshow since 1956—the year when the Chief of Staff of the Air Force went to Moscow on invitation; and thereupon found the Soviets had accomplished far more in supersonic plane development than this country previously knew about.

Shortly thereafter, however, stories were planted in this and other countries of the free world that the Russians, in effect, were abandoning their long range manned aircraft to concentrate on missiles. Mr. Khrushchev said this himself, several times, and apparently we accepted his statement as fact, and we proceeded to rush, following him into the missile field, which latter field we now know has grave problems incident to operational reliability.

At least partly because of what Mr. Khrushchev said, however, for years the previous administration was explaining to the American people that one of the chief reasons for their new emphasis on missiles was because our intelligence had been wrong in saying the Soviets were pushing ahead rapidly with manned aircraft.

The American people were led to believe that the Communists were turning away from manned aircraft so as to concentrate on missiles.

Once again, because of fiscal considerations, we then decided to choose between the two programs of action, only to find out later that the Russians had gone ahead with both.

Nearly 3 years ago I protested, privately and then publicly, about the type and character of information coming out of our intelligence apparatus as against what was entering said apparatus.

Justification for holding down Soviet missile production estimates was primarily on the ground of relatively few firings—but to the best of my knowledge no one took the position that, if this were true, unless one wanted to agree the Russians were not continuing their military buildup, they were also concentrating on manned aircraft.

So for some 4 or 5 years we have, in effect, been hoodwinked as to some of

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11733

in the 5 years since 1955 was 20 percent higher than the average from 1950 to 1955.

Conversely, during the 1950-55 period, imports garnered an increasing share of the U.S. market. The ratio of the volume of imports to U.S. consumers increased from 2.2 percent, in 1950, to 13.4 percent in 1955. However, in 1958, this ratio jumped to 27.2 percent, and last year it reached an all-time high of 32.5 percent. Thus, not only did foreign imports of sheet glass take a hefty bite out of the domestic market formerly supplied by U.S. producers, but it also took most of the new growth in that market.

In the late 1940's and the early 1950's, our country undertook a foreign aid program designed to rehabilitate war-torn Europe and Asia. While our own domestic industries were gallantly enduring the obsolescence of equipment and machinery, we supplied the free nations of the world with the very latest tools for manufacturing. We did this so that foreign manufacturers could produce as quickly and as efficiently as possible for the needs of their countries.

In a manner of speaking, we did not expect those foreign manufacturers to come back and literally bite the hand that helped them. I say this because it has been stated that foreign manufacturers of sheet glass are ignoring the full needs of their own domestic markets for the sake of reaping the tremendous profits inherent in sales to U.S. consumers. Certainly, this is not what our aid program was designed to achieve.

Ignoring the needs of one's own people can be expected of Communist countries. People have no standing with them when the Kremlin masters feel the need for obtaining U.S. dollars. That is why the glass industry today is faced with the added threat to its existence of shipments to this country from Communist countries.

Imports from free world countries pay a small duty upon entering the United States. Imports from Communist countries must enter at full duty rates. But even though imports of sheet glass from Communist countries account for less than 5 percent of the total 1960 sheet glass imports, they have attained a significant increase during the 1955-60 period, coming up from less than 1 percent prior to 1955. Now, however, they are in a position to make a sizable jump, because of increased capacity in their production facilities. And, because of their slave labor conditions, Communist countries are in a position to continue to pay full duty and still undersell not only American producers in our own domestic markets, but all other foreign producers as well.

Mr. President, to save the American glass industry from further harm, and possible total eclipse by foreign producers, it is imperative that President Kennedy immediately impose full duty on sheet glass shipments from non-Communist countries, and full duty plus extra ad valorem charges on imports from Communist countries. Any other course of action may be meaningless to the thousands of American glass workers who are jobless today.

COMMUNIST MENACE IN SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, while the eyes of the American public have been focused on Laos and Berlin and Cuba, a situation that poses an equal danger to our interests and security has been developing almost unnoticed on the mainland of South America.

On August 21 there will be an election in the British colony of British Guiana. The parliamentary leader, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, is an avowed Communist, as are many of his chief lieutenants. If Dr. Jagan and his Peoples Progressive Party win out in the forthcoming election, Jagan will become the first Premier of British Guiana, with full powers over internal affairs under the constitution that goes into effect at that time.

Potentially this situation is even more dangerous than the emergence of Castro. Castro at least is cut off from the Latin American mainland by hundreds of miles of ocean. But a Communist British Guiana would for the first time give the Kremlin a bridgehead on the South American continent, a bridgehead through which Castro and the Soviets could feed in arms and provide support for Communist guerrilla movements in Venezuela, in Brazil, in Colombia, and in all the surrounding countries.

Castro by himself is reason enough for serious concern. But a combination of Castro and a Communist regime in British Guiana would bring us to the very brink of catastrophe in the whole of Latin America.

The people of British Guiana are not Communist. Basically they are Christian and anti-Communist.

There are strong opposition forces within the country. But unfortunately they are compelled to carry on their fight under the most severe handicaps. As of now, Jagan and the Communists have virtually unlimited funds, while the opposition has to scrape for every dollar; Jagan has a monopoly on local radio while the opposition has no radio facilities; Jagan is being given massive support by the Moscow radio, the Peiping radio and the Castro radio, while BBC and the Voice of America are doing nothing to support the opposition. If this totally unequal situation is permitted to persist, Britain and America have no one but themselves to blame if British Guiana goes Communist.

Mr. President, this is a situation we can no longer afford to neglect. I therefore wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to the statement recently issued by Lord Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton, former British Member of Parliament, on his return to the United States from a private factfinding mission to British Guiana.

For my own part, I wholeheartedly endorse Lord Douglas-Hamilton's proposal that the British and American Governments should hold consultations at the highest level to determine what action can be taken to safeguard the freedom of the people of Guiana and to prevent a Communist takeover in that country. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LORD MALCOLM DOUGLAS-HAMILTON ON HIS RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES FROM A PRIVATE FACTFINDING MISSION TO BRITISH GUIANA

I have returned from British Guiana deeply concerned over the grave danger of Communist takeover following the election to be held on August 21. Unless immediate action is taken to support the political forces opposed to Dr. Cheddi Jagan, leader of the majority party, the PPP, there is every possibility that British Guiana will become another Cuba and, this time, serve as a Communist bridgehead on the Northeast shores of South America itself.

I went to British Guiana entirely as a private individual, to examine the political situation first hand for myself and to determine whether new private enterprise from either Britain or the United States has a chance to survive. I have concluded that it has and that there are very considerable potential opportunities, provided only that there is a stable non-Communist government.

Although applauding the decision of Great Britain to grant full independence to British Guiana, I believe that the British Government has still a grave responsibility to the free world and not least to the people of British Guiana of all races, to oversee the perilous period of transition from limited authority to full independence to forestall the establishment of a Communist tyranny. At the present time, the British Government appears to have assumed a strictly hands-off policy in regard to the critical upcoming election.

There are three political parties in British Guiana, each of whom are struggling for power and hope to win the election on August 21, which will provide British Guiana with its first independent government with full control of internal affairs. Under the constitution, full independence from Britain, including control of its foreign affairs will follow by the end of 1962, leaving permission in the intervening period for the British Government to intervene only in grave emergencies.

Dr. Jagan's party is known as the PPP and its local strength is largely based on the Indian population. The two chief political parties opposing Jagan are the United Force, headed by Peter D'Aguiar, a successful and popular British Guiana businessman. The United Force is composed of moderate elements, European, Negro, and Indian, and D'Aguiar's position is that economic strength and the future of the nation lies in stable, anti-Communist government, and close association with the free world. The third party is the People's National Congress, headed by Mr. Forbes Burnham, an attorney, formerly chairman of the PPP before he split with Jagan, whose chief strength comes from the Negro vote and whose appeal is largely racial.

There is every evidence that Jagan is a convinced Communist as he was so described in the official report of the British Guiana Constitutional Commission in 1954, known as the Robertson report. He repeatedly repudiates and scorns the free way of life and democratic institutions except where they can be used to his advantage, and has recently referred to Castro as the great liberator.

Dr. Jagan has called for the creation of a Socialist state and in his own words "communism is only the advanced stage of socialism." In September 1960, Dr. Jagan said: "British Guiana can expect anything should his PPP lose the election, since I will be pursuing a program not only in British Guiana but all over the world." On May 12, 1961, he praised Marxist rules for economic develop-

11730

wars, or the mere threat of such wars. Countries contiguous to or near the Sino-Soviet bloc face a direct threat from without, and an indirect threat from within. We recognize the inadequacy of their forces to cope with an outright Communist invasion. Yet with our assistance we count on their courage and ability to deal with large-scale guerrilla warfare. Should they suffer an open attack across their borders, we look for local forces to resist the initial thrust until such time as free world forces may come to their support.

Third, military assistance must play its part, especially in NATO, in deterring any resort to general war.

It is an unreasonable expectation that a worldwide operation of the size and complexity of the military assistance program should be uniformly successful. But the American people have every reason to demand the maximum return from the substantial resources they are investing in this program. I have pledged the continuous and arduous efforts of the Department of Defense to this end.

Overall, the military assistance program is an essential element of our national defense and an essential tool of our foreign policy. It demonstrates our purpose far more convincingly than words and declarations.

CORPORATE CONSCIENCE AND SENSITIVITY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, William T. Gossett, vice president and general counsel of one of the great corporations of this country and the world, the Ford Motor Co., addressing the conference of the Federal judges of the sixth judicial circuit meeting at Dearborn, Mich., said:

The present-day corporation stands not on the periphery of the democratic process, as it did in the last half of the 19th century, but in its dead center.

The thoughts expressed by this man who has contributed much to law, to business, and the benefit of the whole community, I believe, should be given the widest possible circulation. They show a corporate conscience and sensitivity which the critics of the American scene frequently deny or ignore. He makes most interesting comment on the role of the courts in their perpetual challenge to accommodate the law to change.

In order that many may read this expression by Mr. Gossett, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM T. GOSSETT BEFORE THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, DEARBORN, MICH., APRIL 29, 1961

I am honored to be with you today. An invitation to address an audience of judges—and such a distinguished one—is not to be taken lightly by any lawyer. Having looked up at judges for almost 33 years, it is not unpleasant to look down at a few even for a brief period. But aside from the obvious strain of appearing in this way, before the traditional high quality of the Federal bench, there is on this occasion, a quantitative hazard. I am not only outlearned; I am outnumbered.

Both the Federal bench and the bar today live in perhaps the greatest period of intellectual challenge since the long slow establishment of constitutionalism was accomplished at the hands of John Marshall in

the last century. Social and economic realities, a continuous succession of scientific breakthroughs, unprecedented growth and skyrocketing population trends, the most important revolution in communications since the printing press—all these are transforming the society that the law serves.

As a live and a breathing thing the law will be profoundly concerned with these pervasive changes. You will recall Dean Pound's admonition: "The law must be stable, but it must not stand still,"¹ which today has greater force and relevance than ever.

As we move more surely and more deeply into this new age for mankind, with all its hopeful and unknown implications, one of our most reassuring comforts is that we in America are blessed with strong and flexible legal institutions—institutions that can stimulate our present without compromising our future or destroying our past. The Constitution remains a remarkable foundation and bulwark. Despite the imperfections inherent in representative democracies, our legislative processes are sound, responsive, alive. And the Presidency, through one ordeal after another, has proved its adaptability to new demands.

But the point I want to make today is that it is to the courts that we must look to give meaning to social change—which is to say to relate it to the past and to reconcile it with our continuing experience and our objectives as a people. "There are two principles inherent in the very nature of things," said Whitehead, "the spirit of change and the spirit of conservation. * * * Mere change without conservation is a passage from nothing to nothing. * * * Mere conservation without change cannot conserve. For after all, there is a flux of circumstance, and the freshness of being evaporates under mere repetition."²

Those words of Whitehead were cited more than once by Mr. Justice Cardozo; and one can see why. Cardozo was a great realist among judges, not just bowing to the inevitability of change but hospitable to it, going out to meet it. If changes that were impending, or indeed already there, seemed overwhelming, Cardozo was not only undisturbed but unsurprised. He saw all this as the business of the law and the business of the courts. Said he: "The reconciliation of the irreconcilable, the merger of antitheses, the synthesis of opposites, these are the great problems of the law."³

I emphasize change because it seems to me that, like it or not, we are headed for a volume and a degree of change in the whole fabric of our life wholly without precedent. We must be equipped, in our legal usages, in our vision, in the breadth of our reference, to deal with them. We must deal with them far more speedily than we have ever done before. We must be more than students of the law; we must be students of society, historians before the history has happened.

For the substance of our lives is not the law; we only use it. The substance of our life is the society in which we function—restless, aspiring, full of good intentions, full of errors, incredibly active, driven by the will to get things done.

In all this—if you will permit an inward reflection—the corporate lawyer sees some things with striking clarity. Perhaps more than anyone else in our profession, we live our workday lives outside the law office and outside the courtroom. We are concerned with conduct before the conduct is a concern of the law. We see the clashes of in-

terests before the interests seek litigation. I have often pointed out that we are interested in laws before they are made, in the hope that they never will be necessary, or if necessary, that they will be well-based and sound.

Now there is nothing very neat about all this. We do not draft quasi-legal codes and say that we will permit our companies to go just so far and no farther out of fear that someone will shout, "There out to be a law." We often make a judgment that is social, not legal, mindful that the law necessarily must lag behind society.

It may sound as though I put a strain on the role of corporation counsel. Let me explain very briefly what I have said.

To begin with, the present-day corporation stands not on the periphery of the democratic process, as it did in the last half of the 19th century, but in its dead center.

The democratic process is a continuing and sensitive series of rising pressures and inevitable responses. As a major element in our capitalist society, the corporation occupies a unique place. It has a personality that can be credited or blamed; but unlike the individual, it has very little margin for error because it is without any inherent value. It is valuable only insofar as it serves people. It cannot, therefore, behave cavalierly, as some individuals can. If it makes a mistake, and certainly if it repeats a mistake, something will happen sooner or later to insure that it will never make the same one again. Pressures will rise to police it tighter, to impose new regulations, to restrict it in new ways, sometimes to punish it. And the response will come through the courts, through the legislatures, through labor unions, through consumers; indeed, through all the means available for the people in a democracy to express themselves.

Between the rising pressures and the inevitable responses stands the corporation counsel. His job is to contribute creatively, constructively, to forestall pressures that are overwhelming and to foresee responses that are crippling. He is not a partisan. He is vitally interested in the corporation's growth and survival; but he cannot afford to stand on the platform, "my company right or wrong." If he does, his corporation will not grow and may not survive.

If corporation counsel is to serve his company effectively, then, he will find himself deep in extra-legal activity. But his standards of reference are broader than the statute books or the opinions of the courts. In recent times the lawyer too often has been no closer abreast of society than the present state of the law itself, which necessarily always lags behind. This is something with which some practitioners can still content themselves. But any corporation counsel worthy of his trust must appraise the imponderables involved in popular judgments that lead legislators to make new laws and judges to hit upon new interpretations of old ones.

This seems to me wholly appropriate. Laws exist to serve men and not to master them, and they don't come into being unless we see a need for them. We have not yet extended the reach of the commerce clause to cannibalism simply because—so far as we know—the occasion has not arisen. Similarly, I most devoutly hope—although it is too much to expect—that the volume of legislation touching upon the management of business will come along at a somewhat slower pace during the immediate future than it has in the past. As you—as judges—are concerned with the law and the needs of society, so also corporation lawyers, in their spheres, are concerned with the business of society and the need for laws. In this respect we practice a kind of a priori adjudication of matters before they occur,

¹ Roscoe Pound, "Introduction to the Philosophy of Law."

² Alfred North Whitehead, "Science and the Modern World," 281.

³ Benjamin N. Cardozo, "The Paradoxes of Legal Science," 4.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11729

discriminate against one another. Both Cuba and the United States are members. The United States would have to get a special waiver to invoke an embargo against Cuba.

On the domestic front, cutting off the remaining Cuban imports overnight would cause serious unemployment in critical areas of the country. For instance, Cuban tobacco—the largest remaining import—is absolutely essential to the hand-rolling cigar industry in Tampa, Fla.

For all these reasons, the Government is hoping for lesser legal and psychological devices to strangle Cuban trade slowly instead of killing it in one fell swoop.

One such device under study is to raise preferential tariffs of the Reciprocal Trade Act to the highest levels permitted under the old Smoot-Hawley tariff.

FEW CONTACTS NOW POSSIBLE

On the other hand, this action only harasses trade; it does not stop it. Officials note that doubling or even tripling tariffs poses no problem to a state-controlled economy, provided the foreign government wants dollars badly enough. They say the Cuban Government could arbitrarily reduce all prices of exports to the United States to make them competitive on the American market whatever the tariff.

When all is said and done, the greatest barrier to Cuban imports is the lack of diplomatic relations with this country and the accompanying psychological attitudes on both sides. Very little opportunity for contact exists.

Any American businessman must have a special stamp in his passport to go to Cuba—a stamp the State Department does not give out freely.

Any American businessman who should get to the island would find the system of private trading wholly destroyed. The established banks have been nationalized along with most everything else, and all financial contacts are controlled by the state.

As he makes his way through the new labyrinth of state bureaucracy, he would find little concrete assurance about how, when, and where goods would be delivered or payments received.

NO GUARANTEE SEEN

Even if these obstacles were overcome, the businessman would still have no guarantee that Mr. Kennedy would not invoke the Trading With the Enemy Act tomorrow or the next day. His whole investment could be wiped out overnight.

The Cuban dictator's reaction to the lard confiscation is a good example of how all trade with Cuba can be gradually eliminated without any blanket embargo. Mr. Castro claimed the United States was trying to starve out Cuba, said he would no longer buy lard from the United States.

If Mr. Castro is true to his word, he is cutting out his largest current import from the United States. Last year Cuban lard purchases here were \$18 million—more than half of all American exports to Cuba.

It would not take many more such blows to reduce the current low level of Cuban-American trade to the zero mark, without the international embarrassment of a wholesale embargo.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the able majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. This is a deserved tribute by the leader of the majority party in the U.S. Senate, Mr. President, to a unique and highly able Senator who sits on this side of the aisle, and whose record has been studded with examples of successful devotion to the public trust.

I can remember, in the few years that I have had the honor to sit in this Chamber, many instances, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Montana, when Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, of Delaware, after studying a problem of importance, which nevertheless had not been brought clearly or forcefully to the attention of the rest of the Members of the Senate, made a telling point, stuck to it, and pushed and prodded the Senate into doing its duty, and accepting his point of view.

I can remember that on some occasions, after the Senate stood up in a particular instance, there was disagreement in the other body; but it was Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who acted as the Senate's conscience in obtaining in the Senate a decision that was in the interest of the American people.

I must add that, with the usual grace with which the able majority leader acts, it is he, rather than one of us on this side of the aisle, who has stood up and has embellished the Record with this editorial comment respecting one of our Republican colleagues. Once again I salute him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from California.

MILITARY AID HAS THREE GOALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, our energetic Secretary of Defense, recently found time, despite the heavy burdens of his office, to serve for one day as a columnist for the Northern Virginia Sun. His contribution to that newspaper comprised a remarkably succinct and well prepared analysis entitled "Military Aid Has Three Goals." The Secretary accurately stated that the U.S. military aid program should serve a threefold purpose. These purposes are: First, to enable free and independent nations to protect their internal security; second, to make "local wars" so unprofitable that such wars will be deterred; and third, to play a strong role, especially with NATO, in the deterring of general war.

I commend a reading of Secretary McNamara's article to every Member of this body and to all other thoughtful Americans; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, from the July 12 edition of the Northern Virginia Sun, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEFENSE SECRETARY WRITES: MILITARY AID
* HAS THREE GOALS

(By Robert S. McNamara)

WASHINGTON.—During the past months, along with my military and civilian associates, I have been reexamining a good many programs of the Department of Defense, programs ranging from communications satellites to guerrilla warfare training.

One of the factors that has been uppermost in my mind in evaluating these programs has been the ratio of their cost in dollars to their contribution to the security of the United States. Perhaps the least understood program in this connection, yet one of the programs with the highest ratio of value to cost, is the military assistance program.

Military assistance has always had to do a variety of jobs. The program began with President Truman's decision in 1947 to furnish military aid to Greece and Turkey, without which these countries would have succumbed to Soviet aggression and Communist subversion. Thereafter, military aid played a key role in the development of the first reasonably adequate NATO forces.

As the NATO area became more secure, higher proportions of the program were devoted to Far East areas in jeopardy—Japan, Korea, the Republic of China, and southeast Asia—and to areas south of the U.S.S.R. which historically have been the objects of Russian expansionism, notably Iran and Pakistan. It has helped to provide the stability that is essential for economic progress. As President Kennedy has pointed out, economic aid programs "cannot succeed without peace and order."

Today, as we consider the reasons which dictate continuance of the military assistance program, we look out upon a world still convulsed by rapid change and watched over by strong, resourceful, unscrupulous adversaries ready to take advantage of any show of weakness, indecision, timidity.

For evidence of the Communist threat, we have only to examine the pronouncements of Mr. Khrushchev himself. In his January 6 speech of this year he maintained that Communists are opposed to both world and local wars. There is, however, a third type of conflict which we know as subversion and covert aggression, but which he calls "wars of national liberation" or "popular uprisings." Such conflicts, he says, "Communists fully and unreservedly support."

As President Kennedy pointed out on his return from Vienna:

"In the 1940's and the early 1950's the great danger was from Communist armies marching across free borders. Now we face a new and different threat. We no longer have a nuclear monopoly. Their missiles, they believe, will hold off our missiles, and their troops can match our troops should we intervene in these so-called wars of liberation."

"Thus the local conflict they support can turn in their favor through guerrillas or insurgents or subversion. The future for freedom in these areas rests with the local peoples and their government."

Our military assistance program is designed to meet these extensive and manifold threats to the security of the United States and the free world. It is an integral part of our defense effort. Through the assistance planned, we anticipate an improvement in our ability to deal with aggression in its incipient phases, to furnish help for friends and allies which will be more consistent with the kind of threat they face, and to maintain the facilities abroad required for the quick and effective deployment of appropriate U.S. forces.

We do not claim that what we propose is a cure-all for the complex, variegated threat the forces of freedom confront around the world. But the program we now propose we believe will provide additional flexibility and permit rapid response to a large variety of situations, either internal or direct aggression.

Military assistance should serve a threefold purpose.

It must be more active than ever in enabling free and independent nations to protect their internal security. Our objective here is to help provide the means for local military establishments, with the support and cooperation of local populations, to guard against external covert intrusion and internal subversion designed to create discord and insurrection. Internal stability is an essential component of economic progress.

It must continue to make "local war" clearly unprofitable, and thus deter such

income attributable to the cash distribution is viewed as reduced by only \$68). Accordingly, the basis of the bond to the corporation receiving it will be \$15 despite the fact that the limitation in section 246(b) applies to the dividend received deduction.

Section 3 of the bill provides a special adjustment to earnings and profits which is necessary due to the fact that under the bill the increase in earnings and profits will not be the same as the increase in the basis of the receiving corporation's total assets. For example, if a corporate shareholder receives a bond having a fair market value of \$100, its earnings and profits under the bill are increased by \$100. However, if the basis of the bond of the distributing corporation was only \$50, the receiving corporation's basis for the bond will likewise be \$50, so that on the sale of the bond the receiving corporation will have \$50 capital gain. Since, however, this \$50 was already included in earnings and profits once (as part of the \$100 dividend income), it should not be so included a second time when the bond is sold. Accordingly, the proposed section 312(k) eliminates this double inclusion in earnings and profits.

DESIGNATION OF THE ROSE AS OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BRIDGES, Senator JAVITS, Senator NEUBERGER, Senator SCOTT, Senator TOWER, and myself, I submit a joint resolution designating the rose as the National Flower of the United States. This joint resolution recognizes officially a 35-million-year-old native of America—the rose—as the national floral symbol of the United States.

As the popular favorite for National Flower honors, the rose is unparalleled. Today it is the choice of 1 of every 3 Americans—or some 60 million citizens. In a recent certified national election in which more than 1 million ballots were cast, better than one-third singled out the rose for national honors—more than twice the votes cast for its nearest competitor.

The rose has been immortalized in poetry and holds countless memories for many Americans all across our great land. The rose is the simpleness of our gardens and our homes—it possesses the dignity of solemn occasions, it has the beauty that is America. Its strength is demonstrated by the fact that it grows everywhere in our land. From Alaska to Florida and from Maine to Hawaii the hardy rose is found bringing beauty to its surroundings. Hardly a garden in our land is cultivated without finding a display of vividly colored roses.

Mr. President, we are the only major Nation of the world without a national flower. Great Britain, Iran, Honduras, and Luxembourg have already adopted the rose as their national floral emblem. It is also the official flower of four States—Iowa, North Dakota, Georgia, and my own State of New York.

I hope before long Congress will designate the rose as our national flower. Its symbolic reflection of peace, loyalty, honor and courage and its overwhelming popularity with the American people make its selection logical.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the complete text of the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to join with my colleagues Senators KEATING, NEUBERGER, and SCOTT in support of the Resolution to recognize officially the rose as the national flower of the United States. We in Congress are often compelled to concentrate our efforts on material things. However, we should not lose sight of the importance of observing the great natural beauty around us. For centuries, the rose has been part of the imagery of love for poets of many lands. The rose has its roots deep in our historical tradition; the first settlers on our shores compared the fragrance of their New World to that of the rose garden. The rose is the most prized flower of the normal American garden. Because of its overwhelming popularity and its symbolic reflection of peace, loyalty, honor and courage, it is only right that we recognize the rose as our Nation's floral emblem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 118) designating the rose as the national flower of the United States, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the rose is known to men and women everywhere as the symbol of peace and hope; and

Whereas the rose is the acknowledged favorite of the vast majority of the American people; and

Whereas the rose is recognized as the badge of courage, loyalty, and devotion; and

Whereas the United States is the only major nation which has no official flower: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the flower commonly known as the "rose" is hereby designated and adopted as the national flower of the United States, and the President is requested to declare such fact by proclamation.

FREE ENTRY OF TOWING CARRIAGE FOR USE OF UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 5852) to provide for the free entry of a towing carriage for the use of the University of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA. (S. DOC. NO. 36)

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated March 31, 1961, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, La., requested by resolution

of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON FRESNO RIVER BASIN, CALIF. (S. DOC. NO. 37)

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a favorable report dated August 30, 1960, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Fresno River Basin, Calif., requested by resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted June 26, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. HAMPTON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing on the nomination of Robert E. Hampton to be a member of the U.S. Civil Service Commission will be held Thursday, July 20, 1961, at 10 a.m. in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

The hearing will be open to the public and will be held before the full committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address by him at President's Safety Awards ceremony last month in the departmental auditorium.

Address entitled "World Peace Through World Law," delivered by Senator LONG of Missouri before Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Mo., on May 29, 1961.

Address by Dr. Maurice D. Visscher upon the occasion of the presentation of the Passano Award for 1961 to Dr. Owen H. Wangenstein.

Article entitled "The Case for Medical Care for the Aged," published in the IUE News of June 29, 1961.

Address entitled "Foreign Aid and Freedom," delivered by George Meany, president, AFL-CIO, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. network on July 13, 1961.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him on the Berlin crisis and the Red threat elsewhere in the world.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Address delivered by Representative PAUL A. FINE, of New York, on June 10, 1961, before the New York Department, Jewish War Veterans, on the subject of the activities of the John Birch Society.

Resolution adopted by the American Association of Former European Jurists, relating to the self-employed individuals' tax retirement bill.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "Virtue in the Body of the People," by C. J. Backstrand, president, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa., delivered before the American Good Government Society, Washington, D.C., April 28, 1961.

By Mr. METCALF:

Statement delivered by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives on July 17, 1961, dealing with the saline water conversion program being administered by the Department of the Interior.

Editorial entitled "What Indians Want," published in the Chicago Tribune of July 3, 1961, relating to the recently concluded American Indian Conference at the University of Chicago.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Editorial entitled "Good Ship Hope," published in the Pasco, Wash., Tri-City Herald of June 20, 1961, relating to the mission of the hospital ship SS Hope.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorial entitled "More Inflation in Prospect," published in the Redfield (S. Dak.) Press of July 6, 1961.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Article entitled "Eighteen Georgia NAACP Delegates Call on Talmadge, Russell To Back Rights Bill," written by Albert Riley and published in the Atlanta Constitution of July 13, 1961.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Excerpt from article entitled "It's Going Pretty Good in Arkansas," written by Walter Wingo and published in the Washington Daily News of July 15, 1961.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Tech Historian Plans Trip To Do Research in Africa," written by W. R. Tatum and published in the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal of June 11, 1961, relating to special research work by Dr. Van Mitchell Smith, Jr., into the rapidly changing history of Africa.

Article entitled "Judge Dale W. Harbin, Civil Leader, Succumbs," published in the Stephenville (Tex.) Empire-Tribune of July 7, 1961, relating to the death of County Judge Dale W. Harbin, of Erath County, Tex.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

"President Carlos Garcia Provides Responsible Leadership in the Philippines—Bataan Magazine Praises His Administration"—Introductory remarks by Mr. RANDOLPH and excerpts from Bataan magazine.

SENATOR WILLIAMS, OF DELAWARE, AND THE TRADE EMBARGO WITH CUBA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who more than earn their keep, so to speak, by acting as the conscience of this body as a whole. That does not mean that collectively the 100 Senators who comprise the membership of the Senate do not do good, patriotic, and outstanding jobs. They all do. But there are some who stand out.

I refer particularly to the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Many look upon him as a gadfly. I think we need more gadflies like Senator WILLIAMS, who not only keeps Republican and Democratic administrations on their toes, but also keeps the Senate on it toes. I extend to him my thanks for his constant vigilance

as well as my deep appreciation for the many—and often unsung—contributions he has made in making the Senate a better and more knowledgeable body.

In the Sunday Star for July 16 there appeared an article, written by George Sherman, on the complexities of the partial trade embargo with Cuba. The administration is confronted with an extremely difficult problem in this connection, as the article points out, and is handling it with a full awareness that there is no point in taking one step forward there if the result is two steps backward elsewhere.

No matter how complicated the situation, however, it is improper for the Government procedures in respect to trade with Cuba to lead to profiteering on the situation by one particular United States company or another. The article notes that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has pointed out that, in the eagerness to cut off Cuban imports, a profiteering loophole has been allowed to exist. In bringing this loophole to the attention of the Senate, the very able and distinguished Senator from Delaware has performed a highly useful service. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOLASSES DEAL POINTS UP CUBAN TRADE
FACT: ONLY SUGAR IMPORTS FROM ISLAND
ARE BARRED

(By George Sherman)

The recent multimillion-dollar molasses deal between Fidel Castro and an American company has highlighted the pitfalls in the present informal embargo on trade with Cuba.

In order to stop the Publicker Co., of Philadelphia, from paying Mr. Castro 12 million precious dollars for 120 million gallons of molasses, President Kennedy had to use a combination of public persuasion and behind-the-scenes business bargaining.

The reason: Although the U.S. Government has embargoed all American exports to Cuba—except food and medicine—since last October, it has not outlawed any Cuban import here other than sugar.

In theory, any American citizen or company can still legally import a host of Cuban goods. In fact, however, sugar accounted for almost 90 percent of the \$450 million yearly average value of products Cuba sent here before President Eisenhower cut the Cuban sugar quota last July.

TRADE DWINDLING

In the 2½ years since Mr. Castro came to power, overall trade between the two countries has steadily dwindled. Today exports and imports are almost evenly balanced at somewhere between \$25 and \$30 million a year. Mr. Castro pays for American food (mainly lard) and medicines with sales here of Cuban tobacco, seasonal vegetables, and (before the Publicker affair) molasses.

The only other legitimate source of dollars for Cuba remains the more than \$5 million the U.S. Government pays every year to the 3,500 Cuban workers on Guantanamo Naval Base at the eastern tip of Cuba.

The United States has refrained from any counter action, because it considers Guantanamo, and the Cuban workers who help run it, essential to the national security.

But why has the Kennedy administration not cut off all other sources of dollars? Does the legal machinery exist for a total embargo on Cuban imports?

What other devices exist for limiting trade and what are their loopholes?

THE MOLASSES MATTER

All these questions have been raised by that first small \$200,000 shipment of molasses which arrived in New Orleans last month. It was secretly unloaded at the Publicker wharves before the walls of competitors and Government pressure could stop it.

The White House immediately declared that the import of the remainder of the \$12 million order was not in the public interest. But the company was duly compensated.

Several days later the Department of Agriculture hastily concluded a long-disputed agreement with Publicker to sell 14 million bushels of surplus Government corn at bargain prices—as a substitute for the molasses used in producing industrial alcohol.

The transaction immediately caused an uproar. On the floor of the Senate, Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, charged the administration with paying an \$8 million subsidy to dissuade the Philadelphia concern from dealing with Castro.

He noted that while Publicker—the largest producer of industrial alcohol in the country—is buying surplus corn at 64 cents a bushel, any of its competitors must pay between \$1.21 and \$1.31 a bushel on the open market.

LIMIT ON PROFITS SET

Publicker has answered that the molasses—and later the corn—was essential for keeping open its New Orleans distilling plant with 700 employees. Government officials added that all profits from the corn over 2 percent will revert to the U.S. Treasury.

But Senator WILLIAMS now says he can find no evidence that any of the corn is being shipped to the New Orleans plant. It is going from Government warehouses in Evanston, Ill., to Philadelphia—at Government expense of between 25 and 30 cents a bushel.

But the biggest question is, What happens after the present 12-month corn agreement ends?

The only sure-fire way to stop such transactions would be for President Kennedy to invoke the Trading With the Enemy Act. This act—which dates back to World War I—empowers the President to declare any country an enemy of the United States in time of national emergency, and to require all imports from that country to have a special license from the Treasury Department.

Since the national emergency declared at the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 is still technically in force, the President could in fact make such a declaration about Cuba tomorrow. At the moment, the act is being used against only two countries: Communist China and North Korea.

THE COMPLICATIONS

The President has not extended it to Cuba, because he feels that the amount of trade at the moment is not worth the international and domestic repercussions its stoppage would cause.

Both the White House and the State Department are convinced that Castro would use such an embargo to launch a new propaganda broadside against "American Goliath" attempts to starve out the "Cuban David."

Officials here fear that in many Latin American ears the charges might ring true. The embargo could be construed as a violation of the charter of the Organization of American States, which forbids "economic warfare" against any neighbor in the hemisphere.

Furthermore, State Department officials note that the total embargo would involve this country in complicated international procedures. GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, forbids members to